**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.ESWARAIAH**

**WRIT PETITION No.14365 of 2006**

Between:

R.Sai Reddy.

.. PETITIONER

and

The Asst. Commissioner of Police,
and another.

..
RESPONDENTS

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

**ORDER:**

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned

counsel for the respondents.

It is the case of the petitioner that the 2nd respondent-Inspector of Police, Rajendranagar Police Station, is illegally interfering with the possession of the land in Sy.Nos.26/A and 26/AA of Kadedan village, Rajendranagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

The said allegation has been denied by the 2nd respondent in the counter affidavit stating that one Smt.R.Lakshmamma @ Lakshmi, W/o.R.Anjaiah and Mr.Vadla Lakshmi Narayana, S/o.Late Vadla Kistaiah, have filed a joint complaint on 05-05-2006 against the petitioner and two others alleging that the petitioner and two others have created documents by forging the signatures and trespassed into their lands bearing Sy.Nos.26/A, 26/B, 27/A and 27/B of Kateden village, Shivarampally, Rajendranagar Mandal and they threatened to kill them. Basing on the said complaint, a case in Cr.No.412/2006 was registered for the offence under Sections 468, 471, 420, 446 and 506 IPC and took up investigation.

It is further stated that in fact the petitioner also filed a complaint on 19-06-2006 before the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Rajendranagar, which was endorsed to the second respondent and the same was also entered in the General Diary, dated 19-06-2006, and caused enquiries. During the course of enquiry, it was revealed that the said complaint was not proved and, accordingly, the matter was closed. It is also stated that he never interfered with the civil disputes of the petitioner.

If there is any grievance in closing the complaint, it is always open to the petitioner to file a private complaint before the appropriate Magistrate. Further, the 2nd respondent specifically stated in the counter affidavit that he is not at all interfering with the civil disputes of the petitioner. However, in view of the aforesaid complaint, necessary action

has to be taken during the course of investigation only.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any merit in this writ petition.

The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

22-01-2007

Prv